DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 032 822 HE 000 960

By-Oldt, Esther A.

Antioch Education Abroad: An Evaluation.

Antioch Coll., Yellow Springs, Ohio. Office of Program Development and Research in Education.
Pub Date May 69
Note-7p.; Antioch College Report No. 10
EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$0.45
Descriptors-*Academic Achievement, *Higher Education, *International Education, *International Programs, *Program Effectiveness, Students
Identifiers-*Antioch Education Abroad

The Antioch Education Abroad (AEA) program extended overseas the same experimental pattern of liberal education as practiced at Antioch. This included a planned sequence of study, work, and community living, individualized program options for all qualified students, and financial planning to make a year abroad possible at no more cost to a student than a campus year. The pattern proved workable and, since 1964, about one-half of each graduating class has been on AEA. Because rapid expansion of international education at Antioch and nationally has provoked many questions, the report describes some of the controversial issues in the academic area with reference to AEA's experience. AEA students studied and worked on all continents, adapting their schedules to differing university calendars. According to AEA alumni, educational objectives of the program were achieved. Crediting and evaluation were usually based on examinations and/or professorial statements from schools overseas. Self selection proved successful. AEA students were of high academic quality and remained so during their study abroad and after their return to Antioch. The incorporation of experience abroad into campus structures was one of the weakest aspects of the program. However, the international emphasis of Antioch and its foreign language course offerings rose considerably. (JS)

EDO 32822

ANTIOCH COLLEGE REPORTS

ANTIOCH EDUCATION ABROAD: AN EVALUATION

by

Esther A. Oldt

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

HE000 960

Antioch College reports

OFFICE OF PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT AND RESEARCH IN EDUCATION, ANTIOCH COLLEGE, YELLOW SPRINGS, OHIO, 45387, MAY, 1969

10 Antioch Education Abroad: An Evaluation

By Esther A. Oldt

NOTE.—*Esther A. Oldt helped initiate Antioch College's program of study abroad, which has unusual flexibility and scope as a vehicle for international education. She directed the Antioch program for several years and is now serving as Professor of International Education.*

This report is the tenth in a series on new program developments and research studies at Antioch College. Copies of previous reports, and additional copies of this report may be obtained from the Office of Program Development and Research in Education, Antioch College, Yellow Springs, Ohio, 45387.

STUDENT EXPECTATIONS

In a period of question, turmoil, and demand for innovation in higher education, it may be useful to review some aspects of a program that was innovative in 1957, but that already seems traditional to some college people of 1969. The reasons for the change in perspective cannot be traced precisely. Certainly they have their origins in shifting philosophies of education, both institutional and personal.

It seems clear, however, that there are two definable and quite dissimilar patterns of expectations among students contemplating education abroad in 1970. One of these patterns is not basically different from prevailing attitudes of past Antioch Education Abroad (AEA) students described in this report. Such students have high academic standards in the traditional sense. They are disciplined achievers, whether through self-directed study or in conventional lectures, laboratories, libraries, and tutorials. They expect and want external judgments of their work, through examinations and documented reports, for credits toward degrees. In non-academic life abroad, these students value adaptation to strange cultures, and understanding and communication with people whose modes of behavior, thought, and action may be quite different from their own.

The second pattern-group considers most of the above attitudes outmoded. These students, along with some supporting faculty members, believe that examinations and prescribed studies—all requirements set by faculties and academic disciplines, in fact—are irrelevant and restrictive to the intellectual and emotional development of the individual. Students abroad, then, should not be hampered by required plans of study nor be judged by external examiners. The institution and the education-abroad office should be service and information units, from which each student picks what he wants and needs. Personal development and self-understanding are values dominant over inter-cultural understanding, though the latter may be of importance to some individuals.

The Antioch of 1969, and AEA as an arm of the College, are in the process of trying to adapt to both of these divergent perspectives. Perhaps three-quarters of the present AEA applicants adhere mainly to the first pattern described, the remaining fourth to the second pattern. The Antioch faculty may be similarly divided, numerically.

This report is not intended to comment upon nor judge these divergent trends. I describe them because I must point out that the academic evaluations reported here are based on grades and credits and on a philosophy of international education now in a process of change. The dropping of grades and point averages at Antioch in 1968 and revisions —or at least reviews—of most academic requirements automatically change selection and evaluative procedures for Antioch Education Abroad. Future evaluations of AEA cannot be based on similar data—they will not exist.

The questions with which this report deals, however, are still of major concern to academic faculties as a whole. If those responsible for education abroad can examine past experience in order to sort out what is useful and desirable for their own future programs and purposes, this report may then prove to be helpful to them.

EVALUATION OF STUDY ABROAD

Antioch Education Abroad was innovative because of its extension abroad of experimental patterns in the Antioch definition of liberal education. These included interaction throughout a planned degree sequence of study, work, and living; individualization to afford program options for all qualified students in all fields; and financial planning to make a year abroad possible at no more cost to a student than a campus year and, at the same time, to make it self-supporting for the institution.[1]

All of these experimental patterns proved workable. From fifteen students abroad in 1956-57, the planning year,

[1]For a more complete description of AEA purposes and plans, see *Antioch College Reports* No. 3, January 1962.

enrollments rose to include two to three hundred a year. In 1964, about one-third of the graduating class had had programs abroad; since then about half of each graduating class have been on AEA.

AEA's expansion years have coincided with a national expansion. A 1956 survey by the Institute of International Education disclosed twenty-two college-sponsored academic-year programs for undergraduates abroad. Ten years later there were 208 reported programs with corresponding increases in summer study.[2]

At the same time, few ventures in higher education have been more seriously questioned about their purposes and values, especially for undergraduates. Critics, both believers and unbelievers, have charged that the movement was snowballing without proper controls and that colleges and universities seldom examine their own programs in the light of eductional purposes, let alone the effects of study abroad on program participants.[3]

A few studies have been made, among the earliest the well-known Pace study of 1959 based on the Delaware-Sweet Briar Junior Year Program in France.[4] The bulk of other published material has centered on foreign students in the United States, or summaries and critiques of Americans working abroad. Only recently have some institutions begun long-range studies of their own academic programs and practices.[5]

The Antioch program, too, was challenged on its own and other campuses, as to practicality, purposes, and design, with fears of possible negative effects on students and on the institution. Primary questions for the faculty concerned academic standards. Could study abroad, especially in foreign language areas, be at sufficiently high levels to justify awarding credits comparable to upper-class courses at home? Would it attract students of high caliber, or only dilettantes? If top students did go abroad, would they lose the capacity for sustained discipline, as some thought was the result for the Fulbright grantees? Would study not specifically planned for normal American undergraduate programs have adverse effects on meeting degree requirements, admissions to graduate schools, securing fellowships? What would be the effects on upper-class courses and on campus maturity of sending the best students abroad?

All such questions needed answers that no one could give except through actual experience, observed and analyzed. Not all questions have been answered through formal studies, but a surprising number, in retrospect, were at least reviewed, and some were thoroughly and recurrently examined from several angles. It is my purpose in this report to describe some of the most important questions, especially controversial ones in academic areas.

PROGRAM DEVELOPMENTS

First in order is a brief description of AEA developments as they are related to the evaluations.

The total count of individuals in AEA from 1956 up to the winter of 1969 is 2,060. Of these, Antioch undergraduates number 1,546. The remaining 514 were not Antioch degree candidates.[6] Some 350 of the 1,546 Antiochians are still enrolled. Almost 1,200, however, have completed records that can be examined in various ways. For study purposes, this group in turn is divided into segments of similar programs. Thus, the study of academic records described below is based only on full-academic-year sequences abroad.[7]

After the first two years, 1956-1958, almost all students abroad were enrolled for organized study-work "years" of nine to fifteen months or for three-month study periods in Guanajuato, Mexico, which could replace a campus quarter and be followed by three to six months' work in a Spanish-speaking area.[8]

The table on the next page shows AEA enrollment trends from 1956-68, for Antioch undergraduates only.[9]

Perhaps most notable is the increase of men enrolled in full-year programs—in most coeducational programs women greatly outnumber men. Also significant in evaluations of academic quality is the decline in numbers of short-term non-academic programs from 1960 to 1966, after which the trend reverses. Enrollments are distributed through all fields of concentration in roughly the same proportions as on the home campus.

Where did they study? About 30 per cent in France, 27 per cent in Britain, 15 per cent in Germany, 15 per cent in other European countries. The remaining 13 per cent studied in Asia, Latin America, the Middle East, and Africa, in that order. The total includes all continents,

[2]See Dr. Stephen A. Freeman's discussion in *Undergraduate Study Abroad*, Institute of International Education, New York, 1966.

[3]Dr. Freeman's discussion, *op cit.*, underlines the need, as do publications from Education and World Affairs: A. A. Mitchie in *Higher Education and World Affairs*, 1968; and "Questions and Issues" in *The University Looks Abroad*, 1965. Most international education conferences and publications of the past decade, in fact, have expressed the same concern.

[4]C. Robert Pace, *The Junior Year in France*, Syracuse University Press, 1959.

[5]Most college and university studies so far have been privately circulated self-studies; for example, Earlham and Hollins Colleges, for their own faculties; reports from Indiana University, and from the University of California at Berkeley, Los Angeles, and Santa Barbara. *Predicting Performance Abroad* by Harrison G. Gough and William A. McCormack of Berkeley was being published in the spring of 1969.

[6]The majority of the 514 earned Antioch credits in those Great Lakes Colleges Association programs that Antioch administers. Such students are selected by their own colleges, and Antioch receives no data comparable to that on its own students. Non-degree candidates, therefore, are not included in the studies, only in enrollment figures.

[7]Most of these were 12-15 months, but a full academic sequence abroad could be as short as 6-8 months, depending on the university calendar. The time spent in classrooms in the normal Antioch year is two 11-week quarters.

[8]The Guanajuato program has been studied separately, since courses were graded on the campus system and affected point averages. Also to be done are studies of work experience abroad to test the Antioch theory that extramural experience is significant even to academic learning. Neither of these studies is reported here, however.

[9]Figures for 1968-69 were complete only up to the winter quarter, hence are omitted from the table. The discrepancy between this table and the total Antioch undergraduate figure reported above exists because some students have more than one AEA program, most frequently the 3-month Mexico study period in the freshman or sophomore year, followed by a longer program abroad in the third or fourth year. Hence, the count of individual participants is smaller than cumulative annual enrollments.

AEA ENROLLMENT TRENDS

	Full Year Abroad			Shorter Programs (Except Guanajuato)			Guanajuato		
	Men	*Women*	*Total*	*Men*	*Women*	*Total*	*Men*	*Women*	*Total*
1956-57	5	7	12	2	1	3	(No program)		
1957-58	10	18	28	15	17	32	(No program)		
1958-59	15	22	37	13	13	26	19	18	37
1959-60	24	27	51	14	14	28	16	23	39
1960-61	22	28	50	9	8	17	20	26	46
1961-62	39	46	85	4	10	14	12	31	43
1962-63	54	46	100	4	4	8	14	22	36
1963-64	47	45	92	5	11	16	19	31	50
1964-65	58	55	113	7	10	17	15	25	40
1965-66	56	70	126	3	6	9	22	33	55
1966-67	48	49	97	12	16	28	18	13	31
1967-68	57	57	114	11	16	27	15	30	45
	435	470	905	99	126	225	170	252	422

even Antarctica, where one man spent the geophysical year.[10]

Planning for such divergent regions presented complex problems. Typical programs were as follows.

A student going to France or Germany began with language-refresher courses of 8-12 weeks, followed by 8-12 weeks on a job in the same language area. He enrolled in a university, November-June in France, often worked on a more advanced job in the summer. In the German university year, November through July, a two-month break between semesters afforded a second employment period. Special examinations, Antioch group seminars, and independent study or community projects were added in Antioch centers to meet academic needs not filled by the foreign university.

In other countries, study plans were adapted to differing university calendars, with language study, jobs, and special projects worked in around the academic year. Extramural credits (the term extramural describes practical experience built into the Antioch program) provided flexibility in crediting educational experiences that might not meet advanced academic requirements. Extending general education—the liberal arts and sciences—into upper-class years of an Antioch program, unlike colleges where such work is considered of freshman or sophomore level, allowed students to fit non-specialized studies abroad into degree plans at third- and fourth-year levels.

EDUCATIONAL OBJECTIVES

The rationale for establishing the institutional program abroad was that it would have unique educational values for participants. What the values were or should be, was the subject of recurring discussions among Antioch faculty and students. Statements of purposes and values agreed upon by early planning groups were critically reviewed in 1960 by the Educational Policy Committee, which attempted to formulate institutional objectives in such a way as to facilitate measurement of achievements. Like all committee projects, the result was a compromise that thoroughly suited no one, but it did represent major agreements. An abbreviation of the statement published in the 1962 *Manual* for students follows:

Antioch Education Abroad is intended as

1. A means to further the development and growth of the student's personal philosophy.
2. A preparation for intelligent participation in the student's own society, through comparative experience in other societies.
3. A stimulus to the student's growth in academic competence; this includes knowledge and understanding of international affairs—economic, political, social, and cultural; of the geography and physical nature of the world; and for many students, acquisition of specific competence in one or more languages in addition to their own.

For some students Antioch Education Abroad may and does provide further specialized academic and vocational experience, but this is not a major objective of the program.

Subsequent study groups generally accepted this definition and concentrated on program operations and their effects on participants and on the institution. At present (1969), questions of values and objectives are again being reviewed by several campus committees.

A questionnaire sent to all AEA alumni in 1964 attempted to discover the extent to which they thought purposes had been achieved in their own AEA experiences. The 261 respondents were in substantial agreement with the statement of institutional purposes except for some questioning of the inclusion of knowledge of geography and the physical nature of the world as a program goal. Further comments on the alumni study are included later in this report.

MEASURES OF STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT: CREDITING AND EVALUATION

Official committee examinations of AEA's policies, operations, and specific programs abroad were made every two to three years. Such committees have included both faculty members and students, and sometimes have been chaired by students returned from overseas study. Each group has worked from six to twelve months and usually issued lengthy reports and recommendations to the Administrative Council and the faculty of the College.[11]

AEA crediting and evaluation methods have been the

[10]Roger Brown described his experiences in *Antioch Notes*, May 1959, "Antiochian in Antarctica."

[11]A series of Program Administration Studies by AEA staff and related faculty members resulted in program models, selection of sites abroad, compilation of academic materials from affiliated foreign universities, data on foreign language preparation and learning, orientation materials, information on student jobs abroad, a roster of faculty and staff resources in international education, programs for returnees, and the like. Because of space limitations, I will refer to them further only if they relate to the academic studies under discussion.

focus of continuing critical examination by the Antioch faculty. Two Educational Policy Committee reviews in 1960 and 1962 ended in general endorsements of the system in operation, with some attempts to strengthen it and to clarify its intent and practices for the community at large.

Evaluations of students' academic work abroad were based primarily on examinations and/or professorial and tutorial statements from the universities abroad. If suitable evaluation measures did not exist in normal university patterns, Antioch field staff members negotiated arrangements. On the home campus, such evidence was reviewed and interpreted by the AEA office, the registrar, and the academic fields to arrive at comparable campus norms. Faculty members from fields of concentration accepted or rejected any work done abroad for field credits. Some independent-study projects, such as the Antarctic year's work, were arranged and examined by Antioch faculty; but otherwise home campus staff members were not expected to serve as examiners. This was undoubtedly one reason for the frequent questions about whether AEA standards were commensurate with those at home.

ACADEMIC QUALITY: SELECTION AND PREDICTION

Education abroad was an option for any student performing well in the three areas of Antioch's concern—academic, extramural, and community living. Although there were stated minimum requirements, the student himself reviewed his record with his advisers and usually withdrew his application if he was experiencing difficulty. This was so generally successful that only a few applicants—four to six a year—were officially rejected. Participants were largely self-selected.

Many students dropped out during the complicated process of planning and applying for an AEA year. Staff studies in 1959 and 1964 showed that only half the beginning planners (those who went so far as to have interviews) actually filed applications. This percentage remained constant, as did a subsequent withdrawal rate of 10 per cent of the applicants before departure.

In 1968, Paula Spier, of the AEA staff, reviewed the selection process, particularly staff predictions of success compared with actual performance abroad, of 536 students who had been enrolled in major European programs. Her findings, as based on prediction and performance scales, indicated that staff evaluations, academic performance, and co-operative job performance, in that order, were all significant predictors of successful years abroad.[12] A prior Antioch staff assumption, that job performance would be a better predictor than academic grades, was not borne out by her study. In so far as Antioch and University of California programs can be compared, her conclusions are similar to Gough's and McCormack's "exploratory and tentative pilot study" of 85 University of California students abroad in 1965-66. These investigators determined that the two best predictors among those they had considered were grade-point averages and selection committee ratings of students.[13]

ACADEMIC APTITUDE AND PERFORMANCE

The academic aptitude of Antioch students as a whole is high. By the time that they are eligible for a study year abroad—the third or fourth year of a four- or five-year course—they have also had extramural and community living experience that contribute to their independence and self-reliance. In fact, it has been argued that the quality of the Antioch student body is high enough to make further selection unnecessary. Nevertheless, out of this initially able group, AEA students were further selected as has been described.

That this resulted in an AEA population of high academic quality is clear from several studies. Ruth Churchill, College Examiner, in her study of "The Effect of Antioch Education Abroad on Students' Attitudes," reported that students abroad for the academic year 1959-60 had higher scholastic aptitude and achievement than those of a control group who did not go; they also scored higher on tests measuring knowledge about Europe and on scales measuring intellectual attitudes of complexity and reflection.

In an examination of the effectiveness of achievement examinations in relation to Antioch's general education program, Mrs. Churchill and William John found that "more students who earn *H* [High] grades go abroad than do students with grades of *S* [Satisfactory] or *U* [Unsatisfactory] . . . the trend as a whole is a significant one."[14] All subsequent evidence indicates that students who chose AEA continued high in aptitude and achievement.

A survey of students' records before and after years abroad carries the data one step further. To judge the effects of study abroad on academic performance, we examined the records of the 682 Antiochians (325 men and 357 women) who enrolled for academic years overseas between 1957 and 1965-66. First, as to grade point averages (on a scale of 4=*A* to 1=*D*): although each year a few students below 2.5 were accepted, the group mean for AEA students before departure abroad was consistently just under or just over 3.0 (9-year group mean: 2.98). Thus a large proportion of AEA students were those the College designated "abler" (grade point averages over 3.0 after one year in college, plus high scholastic aptitude scores) or "A-plus abler" (3.5 or better after two years at Antioch). AEA drew 61 per cent of all A-plus abler students in 1963-64, 53 per cent in 1965-66, two years in which such lists were issued by the dean of students.

Academic performance abroad was not equated with campus letter grades and therefore did not affect point averages at graduation. Almost all of the 616 students out of the 682 who completed the year abroad (90 per

[12]Paula Spier, *Predictive Factors in Selection for an Overseas Study Program,* master's thesis, June 1968.

[13]Harrison G. Gough and William A. McCormack, *An Exploratory Evaluation of Education Abroad,* University of California, Berkeley, 1967.

[14]*Some Evidence on the Effectiveness of the Achievement Examinations in the General Education Program.* Ruth Churchill and William John, September 1960.

cent) earned academic credits applied to degree requirements in all classifications—general education, electives, and fields of concentration—normally thirty to forty quarter hours for the year. Numbers and distributions of AEA credits had little significance, however, because they were planned and allocated to meet the needs of individual student programs as approved in advance by the areas concerned.

The determination of the effect of AEA on academic performance, then, rests on pre- and post-AEA academic records, completion of graduation requirements, eligibility for graduate study and awards, and the like.

In summary: of the 682 students who began years abroad, 89 per cent completed (or are completing—a few are still students) Antioch degrees, still as "abler" students. The group mean of the graduates' point averages rose from pre-AEA 2.98 to 3.2 at graduation, a normal rise for students of their ability. The 11 per cent who withdrew before graduation did so for financial and personal reasons, not because of low grades, and almost all completed degrees elsewhere.

The fear that AEA would not attract high caliber students or that they would become undisciplined and perform poorly on their return proved groundless. A few dramatic exceptions there were, indeed, but most AEA students began as high achievers and serious degree candidates, and remained so. Many, perhaps most, could have completed requirements more quickly at home. The fact that they chose to go abroad for a year implies that they regarded AEA as an experience important and enriching enough to add it to their degree programs.

The consistently high caliber of the education-abroad population probably indicates also a fairly consistent degree of respect among students and faculty for AEA as a serious academic venture, rumors to the contrary notwithstanding.

As to the other early questions about possible negative effects of study abroad: there is no evidence that AEA was a handicap to students in meeting undergraduate degree requirements or in being admitted to graduate schools. What evidence there is in fact suggests the contrary. About half (47 per cent) of the 261 alumni who answered the 1964 questionnaire considered AEA an important advantage in completing their Antioch degrees; 7 per cent thought it detrimental. As to securing graduate fellowships, again the evidence is positive. Of the 235 alumni who answered this question, 63 per cent had already had graduate study, with 61 per cent recipients of fellowships, teaching assistantships, or other academic awards.

It might have been predicted that AEA students, because they were not as well known to their field advisers as were students who took all courses on campus, would not stand as good a chance for academic awards depending on faculty nominations. Even without exhaustive examination of the situation, the list of Woodrow Wilson awards to Antioch seniors since 1958 seems to indicate that AEA was no handicap: 68 per cent of all who received awards were AEA students. If we eliminate graduates of 1958 and 1959, when few seniors had had AEA opportunity, the figure rises to 74 per cent. Danforth awards to Antiochians in 1966-67-68 all went to graduates of Antioch Education Abroad.

EFFECTS ON CAMPUS

The incorporation of the students' experience abroad into campus structures has been at Antioch as at most institutions one of the weakest aspects of the whole program. Removing sizable groups of able upper-class men and women from advanced courses caused noticeable gaps for the first two or three years, but as AEA numbers increased in predictable fashion, students abroad could be replaced to create a larger campus population resulting eventually in more fourth- and fifth-year students. Most AEA students returned to campus with enlarged perspectives and a variety of academic exposures that sometimes greatly enriched senior seminars.

Some fields of concentration in some years were brilliantly successful in using the combined experiences of their seniors in field seminars; others seemed hardly aware that their majors had studied abroad and occasionally were actively hostile, especially to those few AEA seniors who had difficulty meeting field requirements.

A few integrative seminars for seniors (the culminating general education experience) were designed specifically for a cross section of AEA returnees—two self-explanatory examples: *The American in Europe* and *America in the Foreign Press.* These were sporadic attempts at cross-field integration, however, dropped when an individual instructor left the College or was away from campus on sabbatical leave. There have been none since 1966-67, and there were no such opportunities for fourth-year students who had been abroad in the third year of a five-year course, though courses of this nature are most needed the year the student returns to campus.

On the other hand, there has been a steady rise in the total international emphasis both in Antioch's academic offerings and in the constitution of the faculty. This is evident from comparisons of College catalogs from 1953 to 1967, and studies of the international training and experience of the Antioch faculty in the past five years. Such developments cannot be directly attributed to Antioch Education Abroad. Rather they are coincidental and mutually reinforcing. As students have become more internationally experienced, so have the faculty and the entire orientation of the institution.

In one academic area, however, foreign languages, AEA has had a direct bearing. The number of languages taught on campus increased from three to seven, and course offerings more than doubled. Course and enrollment increases followed directly the patterns of AEA expansions into different language areas.

OTHER QUESTIONS

This discussion has omitted direct consideration of the quality of study done abroad. Indirectly, the evidence cited does indicate something—that over-all achievement has been of sufficiently high quality to be acceptable for upper-class credits in all academic areas. While neither Mrs. Spier's nor Mrs. Churchill's study deals directly with

this question, both contain implications as to generally high performance abroad. Mrs. Spier's study especially states that achievement has been substantially higher than the home staff would have predicted—that "the College has a right to be pleased with student achievement." The overwhelming majority of the 261 questionnaires from AEA alumni retrospectively rated AEA academic experience as highly important to present enjoyment of studies, to the broadening of general education, and in influencing present reading and study. But though these responses endorse institutional objectives, they cannot be considered an evaluation of quality of work done abroad.

Detailed examination results and tutorial evaluations are filed with individual student records, but an over-all survey-analysis of this information remains to be made.

This deliberately limited report also covers only by implication studies of other areas that most observers, including this writer, consider equally important, perhaps more important than academic standings. Does a student abroad acquire understanding of other cultures, other values, other peoples? Are his own values and opinions changed? Are there impacts on his activities and way of life? Does the experience abroad contribute to understanding of self?

These have not been ignored in Antioch evaluations. Some few studies have been completed, more begun, and masses of materials yet to be sifted and arranged have been collected. It is to be hoped that the years ahead will see many more studies completed and distributed for criticism and discussion.